

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 ON DEMAND DIRECT RESPONSE, LLC, et al.,)
11)
12 Plaintiff(s),)
13 v.)
14 SHANA LEE MCCART-POLLAK,)
15 Defendant(s).)

Case No. 2:15-cv-01576-MMD-NJK
ORDER

16 Pending before the Court is, *inter alia*, whether the Court should hold On Demand in contempt
17 for failing to produce documents as ordered. *See, e.g.*, Docket No. 297. “Sanctions for civil contempt
18 may be imposed to coerce obedience to a court order.” *General Sign Corp. v. Donallco, Inc.*, 787 F.2d
19 1376, 1380 (9th Cir. 1986). It has been represented to the Court under penalty of perjury that the
20 documents at issue have not been produced because a third-party vendor will not release them without
21 payment. Docket No. 300 at 4. At the hearing on this matter, counsel expressed a willingness generally
22 to make payments to comply with the Court’s orders. *See* Docket No. 321 at 10 (transcript for hearing
23 of February 23, 2018). It is not clear whether counsel has now paid the third-party vendor, such that the
24 documents at issue have been produced to Ms. McCart-Pollak.

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 Accordingly, On Demand shall file a supplement identifying whether the third-party vendor has
2 been paid and, if so, whether the documents have now been produced. That supplement shall be filed
3 by March 22, 2018.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: March 8, 2018

6
7 
8 _____
9 NANCY J. KOPPE
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28